

## Illinois State University ISU ReD: Research and eData

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

Spring 3-27-2013

# Senate Meeting, March 27, 2013

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, March 27, 2013" (2013). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 920.  
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/920>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact [ISUReD@ilstu.edu](mailto:ISUReD@ilstu.edu).

**Academic Senate Minutes**  
**Wednesday, March 27, 2013**  
**(Approved)**

***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order.

***Roll Call***

Senate Secretary Susan Kalter called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Approval of Minutes of March 6, 2013***

**Motion XLIV-56:** By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Hoelscher, to approve the minutes of March 6, 2013. The motion was unanimously approved.

***Presentation: Export Control Progress and Planning (Darrell Kruger, Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, Alice Maginnis, University Council)***

**Senator Kruger:** About a year ago, the Senate passed an export control policy. In the last year, the committee has been working on the export control infrastructure. There are five elements of export control. We developed procedures that would provide a detailed road map to implementing many of the elements. The five in particular are shipping, purchasing, research, hiring and travel. Presently we have a website and those elements will live on the website together with the policy. The survey that we developed is to take the pulse on where the hot spots are for export control issues. The final survey is very user friendly. The fourth component, we have built a website, we've got the policy, the procedures are about finalized and the survey will live on the website as well. We will continue to populate and update the website so it is accessible to faculty and staff. The final component of export control is the IPEC Officer—Intellectual Property/Export Control Officer. That process is well underway. We are interviewing candidates this week and we hope to have someone in place by the end of April. That person is going to have to do lots of educational outreach in the first year going to all 36 schools and departments and working directly with faculty and staff to give the education part of export control and to get a good sense of the hot spots. The website is the gateway to the survey I mentioned. The final slide refers to shipping and traveling. This represents two questions and based on your answers to the questions, you would be directed to connect with the export control officer for further consultation and advice. Export control is a compliance issue and the goal is to share this with the campus community.

**Senator Cox:** I am curious about the significance the Export Control Policy has on faculty in terms of the number of projects or dollar amounts. Could you give me some idea what role this policy plays in our research? For example, the survey that you are sending out—it will be sent to all faculty or those faculty engaged in projects or research that have that component?

**Senator Kruger:** Some institutions are doing a more targeted approach. What we are attempting to do with the export control officer is we would like for all faculty to take the survey so that we can determine where there might be export control issues. It is not limited to research; it also pertains to travel. If you travel abroad and you are not going for university business, but you take a university computer with you, we need to have a good sense of when folks might be taking university equipment abroad.

**Senator Morey:** A lot of us don't understand what all this entails. Does this mean that anytime I go to a conference or I am working with study abroad and have a university laptop with me, will that have to be checked in some way?

**Ms. McGinnis, University Council:** In the draft procedures, we were trying to create tools for faculty and staff to use really as informational items to figure out if there might be an export control issue that might impact

travel. We set up a list of frequently asked questions that might raise issues related to export control. For example, if you are going to be attending a conference in a sanctioned or an embargoed country, then the website would direct you to talk to the export control officer about protections you might want to take in terms of equipment and export control data. It's not an every time, all the time exercise. It is intended to promote awareness and for faculty and staff to self-identify when export control might apply.

### ***Chairperson's Remarks***

**Senator Holland:** There was a little bit of a snafu in Executive Committee about General Education. It is on the agenda and if anybody does not want it there, it would take a two-thirds majority vote not to have it there.

### ***Student Body President's Remarks***

**Senator Manno:** Student elections will take place April 2 and 3 for ARH and SGA. Our food pantry is open. We have already had students utilize its resources. Information on how to receive the food is on the SGA website. Donations are always welcome. Diversity Week will be held next week ranging from a banquet to informational type events to highlight the importance and significance that diversity plays in our culture and in student life. Senator Devlieger and other on-campus senators have developed a Cardinal Court recipe booklet for students in Cardinal Court. We have 25 recipes to help those students utilize their ability to cook in their apartments. Today, we had a "Spread the Word to End the Word". Students signed a pledge banner to end the word retard and pledged to show respect toward this cause.

### ***Administrators' Remarks***

- ***President Al Bowman - Absent***

- ***Provost Sheri Everts***

**Provost Everts:** Next week will be the Academic Affairs Planning and Budget Presentations on April 2 from 8:00 a.m. to noon and April 3<sup>rd</sup> from 8:00-10:30 a.m. If you would like the specific agenda, that is on the provost's website. We will have the open forums for the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies finalists. They will be here the week of April 8.

- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Larry Dietz***

**Vice President Dietz:** I want to commend the students on the cookbook. At last count, 76% of the students living at Cardinal Court have purchased board plans. I just returned from a meeting of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. It is an organization that conferred upon Illinois State as being in the top 25 institutions in the country for our role with civic engagement.

- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Layzell***

**Vice President Layzell:** We are in the midst of the spring legislative session. The governor released his budget for FY14 which included a 4.9% decrease in funding for all public universities. We are now beginning our legislative hearing process on our budget. Last week, President Bowman, Provost Everts and myself travelled to Springfield for a Senate appropriations committee hearing. It went very well. We will go later in April for the House appropriations hearing and then the negotiations, which are already underway, will really ramp up. Discussions on the budget are paired with what will happen with pension reform. There are numerous proposals being floated. All will have a three-pronged approach. There will be some sort of cost shift on the employer contribution. There will be some increased cost put on the employees with regard to their contribution. Thirdly, there will be some guarantee that the state will fund at some level higher than they are now to bring them back to financial viability. There will be a Benefits Choice Fair Thursday, May 2, from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. in the Brown Ballroom. The various state-sponsored vendors for health, dental, vision and life insurance plans will be there to answer any questions, although we do not know at this point who the state-sponsored vendors will be. They are in the process of determining that. Finally, at the last meeting, Senator Kalter asked about parking and some of the shortages that have been noticed. There are 300 fewer spaces on campus this year largely due to the

Hancock renovation. We would like to remind faculty and staff that you can park in the green zone, the commuter lots if you are not able to find a spot in the faculty staff surface lots. On the south side we have been converting a number of what were previously metered spaces and business permit spaces to faculty-staff surface spaces and also commuter spaces that those with a faculty-staff permit can use. My request would be if you do notice that spaces do not seem to be available when they once were, let Parking and Transportation know. They are trying to free up as many as possible.

**Senator Kalter:** I followed up with the person who contacted me this morning. He says that they have now put up signs so faculty can park on both sides of the street. I think that is what you meant by converting business spaces. He said, 'while this helps some, it doesn't really solve the problem. I came in today and could not find a space either on the street or in the lot. I think they just took away too many faculty parking spaces.' It sounds like it's about coming in later in the morning. I may ask this person to contact you directly.

**Vice President Layzell:** I would be happy to find out if there are particular times where people are finding it difficult to get a spot and we will see what we can do.

#### ***Committee Reports:***

##### ***Academic Affairs Committee:***

**Senator Gizzi:** Academic Affairs finalized our comments for the Information Item.

##### ***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:***

**Senator Kalter:** The committee began its discussion on the results of the poll that we put out on the Chairpersons Policy. We are going to continue that next time.

##### ***Faculty Affairs Committee:***

**Senator Horst:** The committee had a presentation by Kathy Young and Alice McGinnis on the Intellectual Property Policy and we will be reviewing that.

#### ***Planning and Finance Committee – No Report***

##### ***Rules Committee:***

**Senator Fazel:** Tonight, we have the Code of Ethics as an Information Item and also we worked on assigning volunteers to External Committees of the Senate.

#### ***Action Items:***

##### ***02.28.13.01 Priorities Report (Planning and Finance Committee)***

**Motion XLIV-57:** By Senator Rich to approve the Institutional Priorities Report. The motion was unanimously approved.

##### ***02.28.13.02 Freedom to Participate in Shared Governance Policy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

**Motion XLIV-58:** By Senator Horst to approve the Freedom to Participate in Shared Governance Policy. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### ***Information Items:***

##### ***03.18.13.01 Academic Freedom Policy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

**Senator Horst:** This is the second component towards clarification of academic freedom and shared governance. It is in reaction to the Garcetti v Ceballos case. This policy tries to discuss how academic freedom is applied to different members of the institution. In this document, you have language that comes from the Illinois State Constitution. These principles are already imbedded in a lot of our documents. I want to call special attention to the definition. It comes from the AAUP recommendation and the University of Minnesota Board of Regents' definition. It is adding an important clause saying that academic freedom is the freedom to

discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write without institutional discipline or restraint on matters of public concern as well as on matters related to professional duties, the functioning of the University, and University positions and policies. The clause on matters related to professional duties, the functioning of the University, and University positions and policies is a clause that was directly crafted in response to the Garcetti v Ceballos case. There are some legal implications to this clause that Alice McGinnis would be free to discuss with you, but we feel it is important to enact this definition because it is a way to address the concerns that have been raised by the AAUP.

**Senator Fazel:** When we talk about academic freedom, my understanding was it applies to academics. Participation in university activities and professional duties I would consider shared governance. Does academic freedom also cover shared governance? Is this the result of the new case?

**Senator Horst:** Partly, but if you read the AAUP executive summary, they talk about how the role of the faculty member in institutional life as an officer of the institution. In the AAUP documents going back to 1940, they tie together the institutional governing with the principle of academic freedom.

**Ms. McGinnis:** The AAUP definition has really expanded the scope of academic freedom to encompass more than to just the freedom to teach what you like. I did want to articulate a concern that the General Council Lisa Huson had about this definition. The breadth of the definition is vast and we feel that there is a risk of increased lawsuits potentially against the university that could be created by expanding this definition. We are worried about the perception of actions taken based on what might be protected speech.

**Senator Horst:** The committee discussed this in great detail the idea of protecting the rights of university members as a whole, versus protecting the university from lawsuits from individuals and we decided to go forward with this definition because we thought it was important to think of the rights of the entire body and not being so concerned with any particular lawsuits. We are very respectful of the legal arguments and we hope that you consider both sides.

**Senator Gizzi:** In regard to Senator Fazel's comment, we don't have the freedom to teach whatever we want.

**Senator Horst:** That's why the definition has two components. The responsibility implies the faithful performance of professional duties and obligations.

**Senator Holland:** Would legal counsel consider it a contract between the student and the university that a faculty member teach what a catalog copy says is going to be taught in the class?

**Ms. McGinnis:** That issue would have to be deferred to the department or college at issue. There are legal arguments that can say what's in the catalog constitutes a contract, but it's not the only thing.

**Senator Hoelscher:** For the language that legal counsel is concerned with, is there some middle ground?

**Ms. McGinnis:** There may be some middle ground, but the fundamental issue will be there by trying to define academic freedom in a way that encompasses the range of activities.

**Senator Fazel:** Academic freedom is anything relevant to my responsibilities. Could a department chair tell a faculty how to manage your course? There are a lot of ambiguities and lack of clarity about what it actually means.

**Senator Horst:** Betsy Lugg, who was on the committee before, her courses, the entire curriculum and the class plans are crafted in a tightly controlled curriculum that's being mandated by the state, so academic freedom can mean a lot of different things. I think we want to keep the policy general and not necessarily delve into how it applies to every situation.

**Senator Ellerton:** I think we need to clarify the distinction between academic freedom and academic responsibility.

**Senator Horst:** The definition is coming from the AAUP and is coming from Minnesota. I think it is trying to be vague just as a guide. I think your question would be addressed with the phrase professional duties and obligations.

**Senator Kalter:** The language that we are adding has been recommended by the AAUP and I think that that is very important because they are paying attention to what's going on a national level in the court cases that are coming up through the various district courts and we are trying to make sure that what we said and meant in the beginning is honored. I don't think we are adding any risk here. We are giving people the broadest protection from being fired without cause, but that doesn't mean that we are fully protected regardless of what we say. That has never been claimed.

**01.17.13.04**    *General Education Cover Memo (Academic Affairs Committee)*

**01.17.13.02**    *General Education Catalog – Final Draft (Academic Affairs Committee)*

**01.17.13.01**    *General Education Catalog Copy-Markup (Academic Affairs Committee)*

**01.17.13.03**    *General Education Catalog-Current Language (Academic Affairs Committee)*

**03.21.13.02**    *Current General Education and Proposed Program Structures Compared (Academic Affairs Committee)*

**Senator Gizzi:** Tonight the Academic Affairs Committee brings to you the proposed structural changes to General Education, which were presented to the Senate by Jonathan Rosenthal earlier this month. These changes represent the results of the General Education Task Force, which consisted of numerous faculty and worked on over an 18 month period. The proposals were brought to the Council on General Education and unanimously approved; they were vetted by the University Curriculum Committee and unanimously approved. There have been numerous opportunities for input by faculty, departments, schools, and colleges. There were open forums, presentations at the CTLT Symposium. The process has been conducted in a transparent manner. It is a model of shared governance.

The Academic Affairs Committee has taken its responsibility to review the proposed changes seriously. We first met with Jonathan and went over the changes, point by point. We then developed a strategy to best gain input on the issues. We opted to bring the issue to the senate, and ask Senators to provide us with any concerns. One senator did; and we considered those concerns. There was a question about why the new Gen Ed program drops social science requirements from 4 courses to 3. We studied the issue and determined that the choice makes good sense. It provides parity in that there are 3 courses of each of the four major content areas (social science, fine arts, humanities, math science tech). There is also parity with the Illinois Articulation Initiative, putting us in alignment with other colleges in Illinois; and reduces general education to 39 hours. It provides students with one additional elective, something which many degree programs lack.

There was concern that we were not considering the impact of the one less social science course on departments. No department has made any complaint about the process throughout the last two years. Department chairs were consulted, and informed. Some departments have moved, such as Sociology, to have an additional course proposed in other general education categories.

We were asked to have a Financial Impact study conducted for all impacted departments. First, no department has requested such a study. Second, there are many variables that cannot be fully accounted for at present.

These include course realignments, new courses being added to the program, possible changes in section size, staff reassignments to other courses in the major as well as student choices of which courses they will take. As General Education has evolved over the years, departments and schools have quickly redistributed capacity and absorbed the changes.

We were asked why there were originally more social science courses in general education as approved 20 years ago. One reason was simply that those departments had the capacity to offer the classes to the needed numbers of students. The Individuals and Societies category was designed to be broad in focus and its description and goals are very similar to outer-core social science. The fact that there was an outer-core social science course in addition to the Individuals and Societies class had much to do with the original program design, which, as Jonathan indicated at the last meeting, had an overlay of additional requirements that necessitated four courses to be in balance. Those overlay requirements were never implemented.

We were asked to consider why the psychology course represents a majority of credit hours taken in the Individuals and Societies category. All Teacher Education candidates are required to take the general psych course; and as a result they do so to fulfill their social science requirement. These students are under huge pressures - with lots of degree requirements. IF the teacher education programs want to change their Degree requirements to require their students take an additional social science course on top of the psych course, that is their prerogative, but it is not the place of the Academic Senate to dictate program requirements.

The general education program being brought to us today has three key changes.

- 1) It adopts a new set of goals modeled on the American Association of College and University's LEAP goals, widely used nationally.
- 2) It simplifies the three tier model of general education (which has never been implemented as planned) to a two tier. First year students have always taken middle-core courses in their first semester. There are many years of data that demonstrates that they are successful in those courses. The move to a two tier model, simply codifies what has been actual practice.
- 3) It merges the Individuals and Society with outer core social science categories. This results in parity among content areas (3 courses each, instead of 3 in all categories except social science which had 4) and reduces total hours in general education from 42 to 39 hours.

We believe these changes are justified, make sense, and will ask the Senate to approve them at the next meeting.

**Senator Kalter:** I think something that was asked was taken as a complaint, but was more about clarification of our curricular policies. I am not sure that this needs to be something that we clarify before we look at general ed changes right now, but it should be clarified in the future. I was unable to find in our University Curriculum Committee Policy a very clear statement that General Ed does not go through individual department curriculum committees. I think it is important that we soon clarify how General Education is to be treated.

**Senator Gizzi:** The reality is the department and school curricular committees, their task is to make recommendations for changes in their departments and schools. Those go to college-level committees, which then go to the University Curriculum Committee. They have no role whatsoever in General Education and never have. General Education is vested in the Council on General Education, which is an External Committee of the Academic Senate. Changes to the structure go from CGE to UCC to us. The addition of courses within the program, if my department wants to add a course to a category, that goes to CGE and they are given the ability to say yes or no.

**Senator Kalter:** That may be how it is working and agreed on. It is not clear in our written policies. I would like for us to look at our policies and make sure that they not only conform to practice, but also that we all agree to that practice.

**Senator Stewart:** I don't know if it is a particular policy, but it is laid out in the Blue Book that CGE is an External Committee of the Senate. We are going to introduce the bylaws today and it pretty clearly lays out who is in it and why they are in it. It's all there.

**Senator Kalter:** Since I am apparently not making myself clear, perhaps the three of us could get together and I can clarify what I mean by that. My second thing--I don't necessarily want a full financial implications form, but when you are talking about a change that could involve 5,000 to 7,000 to 10,000 students per year, it is important for us to understand how many seats we have in those courses. What is the financial impact going to be when we take those seats from departments that are currently offering that curriculum? It's not so much where they are going to go because it's probably going to be very spread out. If we are talking about cutting an entire category, it's conceivable that we are in that motion going to be cutting university jobs. I think we need to have some idea of what the impact is going to be. If that is not the case, I would like to know it because it would help me as to how I want to vote. I would like to see something about the financial implications before we vote.

**Senator Holland:** Provost Everts would it be possible to get some fix on that in the next couple of weeks?

**Provost Everts:** I think it's going to be difficult to get a specific fix on it. I think we have had in general terms some of the conversations that went on that Senator Gizzi mentioned previously.

**Vice President Jonathan Rosenthal:** Senator Gizzi in his remarks outlined the basic fact that there are many moving parts. Students will make different decisions; department chairs will make decisions about staffing in any given semester. We have faculty who move from General Education to the major; we have variations in section sizes. Speaking from experience, when we eliminated Foundations of Inquiry and when we introduced the category exemption, there was no reduction to faculty lines; there was no reduction to non-tenure lines. Those folks were redeployed in various ways. It would be difficult to get a number because of all of those moving parts. Chairs are very good at redeploying their resources.

**Senator Holland:** What you are saying is the two closest things that we have had like this would be killing off FOI and also the exemption and had essentially no effect on anyone, whether it be redistribution between departments?

**Provost Everts:** I was not here, but my understanding is that it had no effect.

**Senator Gizzi:** When the concern was brought to us, we said that we would consider it, but neither Senator Stewart nor I said that we would do it. We brought it to the committee and the committee considered it. If you want to propose that as an amendment next week, then do so and the Senate can debate it. Right now, other than this one concern, we haven't heard anyone voicing a concern for a financial impact study.

**Senator Holland:** Senator Kalter is probably in one of the better positions to actually consider that.

**Provost Everts:** The chairs met with Jonathan and the steering committee throughout the process. I think it was primarily a working group that discussed that.

### **03.11.13.01      *Council on General Education Bylaws (Academic Affairs Committee)***

**Senator Stewart:** There was one question about ex-officios, whether they are voting or non-voting. The ex-officios on the Council on General Education would be voting members.



**Senator Kalter:** When I thought about who are the ex-officios were, each one of them makes sense as to why you would have them. I do want to express a bit of concern in terms of the ratio of ex-officios to faculty going up from nine to three to nine to five. We should remember that the CGE Chairperson is a faculty member. That is a faculty and an ex-officio role. Thinking about some of the things that have happened around the country in terms of shared governance and the people who should have direct control of our curriculum, the AAUP tells us that is, in general, given to the faculty. Here we have a strong tradition of student participation in that. I have some concerns about the proportions.

**Senator Stewart:** We will talk about that in committee.

**Senator Fazel:** In all of our committees, we have tried to have the faculty hold the majority. In this case, one of the members is an ex-officio. Otherwise this would be equal: 9 faculty, 4 students and 5 ex-officios if we did not have a faculty ex-officio.

**03.11.13.02**     *AIF Recommendations (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)*

**03.11.13.03**     *AIF Data Groups (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)*

**03.11.13.04**     *AIF Report Table (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)*

**03.11.13.05**     *AIF - Credits (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)*

**03.11.13.06**     *AIF – Major Ratio (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)*

**03.11.13.07**     *AIF – Request for Data (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)*

**Senator Kalter:** This year, Planning, Research and Policy Analysis were helpful in giving us a lot of data that helps us look at certain kinds of trends in terms of student demand, credit hours, tenure-track faculty to majors, etc.. What we are addressing in the first recommendation is making the observation that in this process of planned or unplanned reallocation that there seems to have been an impact on larger colleges that is disproportionate so that they tend to have more deficits in faculty than the smaller colleges. So we are asking for attention in particular to the College of Arts and Sciences. We are asking for some attention to CAS and Milner Library in terms of the decreases over the last 15 to 20 years that they have seen in the number of tenure-track faculty there.

The second recommendation is to ask for more long-range planning. The allocations for the AIF have tended to be on a year-by-year basis. To some extent that has to be the case, but we are saying we are concerned with the apparent focus on short-range over long-range planning. We ask in recommendation number three that we devise an expedited authorization process possibly looking to replacing the AIF altogether if that is recommended. Dr. Layzell and Provost Everts love this model because it has protected our tenure-track ranks, but the committee talked about how you have to reconsider and make sure you are still using a good financial model.

Number four is a restatement of the original foundation of the AIF which was to make sure that tenure-track faculty are allocated where there is demand. There are very few departments where there is decreased demand. It is either steady or increased. Number five—we have faculty in our library. In many cases the AIF allocates funds based on credit hours and our particular library does not generate that, so we need to have a model that is an alternative to the way the rest of the colleges get faculty so we can figure out how to get tenure-track lines to Milner. Number six, we are pleased to see that the AIF will have a permanent merit based adjustment and we are saying to make sure that it is not too big. We were seeing inversion and compression issues and the assumption of the AIF was that if you retire, you are going to be making more than the person we hire into your job. In some colleges and departments, that is not the case. We were seeing the pot kind of gradually shrink and we want to make sure it does not do that, but we also want to caution that it not get to large.

Number seven we are talking about protecting tenure and tenure-track lines and putting out that we should maintain a ratio of 75% tenure track faculty to the total faculty. If some departments are under that, we are calling attention to that and say can we raise these ratios or can the Senate be presented with some compelling

reasons about why that ratio should be lower. The committee also expresses concern about the length of time it takes from submission by departments to the announcement of lines for colleges. It has been very difficult for the provost, but as early as possible will help for the planning of departments and colleges. Nine is a reminder that the kinds of data that PRPA collected are not the only kind of data that we need to look at. For example, different missions such as whether you have a Ph.D. program versus a bachelor's only program have an effect on whether you want to allocate more or less faculty. Finally, there was a college-wide budget meeting that mirrored the university-wide budget meeting that the provost mentioned earlier. We recommend that every college have a college-wide budget meeting open to everyone. The individual department chairs give their case for the budget they are asking for from their particular dean. At the end (of our recommendations), we request some dialogue going back and forth about these recommendations next year.

**Senator Rich:** Deficit appears in a number of places. That could be relative to a number of things. The word demand needs a definition. In number four and number nine, the various metrics there tend to relate to instruction alone. In recommendation number two in terms of terminology, apparent focus on short-range over long-range planning. What elements of the data should we be referencing to see that? I think you have already answered that in terms of what we should look at—the process not just the data. In number one, the perception of zero sum game. The clearest long-term allocation as you mentioned are the tenure-track faculty in Milner and the growth in the Mennonite College of Nursing. When building a case for tenure track additions, is there a link to reallocation that helps that case or is it independent?

**Senator Kalter:** There is a very complicated scenario going here and nationwide regarding the zero sum game. This is about institutional priorities so one of the things the AIF tends to encourage in a negative way is a zero sum way of thinking about tenure-track faculty. The provost has done a great job in building the number of faculty and what we see in the past year is partly a result of these big retirements, partly a result of pension situations. There are many factors. What we are calling attention to is a question of what we want to do is reallocate given that demand tends to be steady or increasing in most departments or do we need to be adding. Mennonite is an interesting case because that came in after the AIF was instituted. When you add a full college, how do you populate that college without hurting the other colleges? Can you do it through reallocation or must you build numbers. What we are calling attention to in number one is that perhaps it is not a good model that we can simply reallocate. Deficit is a historical issue, not necessarily an absolute issue. So what we asked from PRPA was since the beginning of the fund and for the last ten years. You will see that CAS, CAST and Milner have had deficits in both ranges. The reason why the 1996 date is an important date is because lines used to sit in the department. So we have some understanding of a kind of stability there. It is not that we want to necessarily go back to that moment, but we see trends of loss of faculty with either steady or building demand. That's the concern. The AIF addresses instructional capacity. When a tenure-track faculty leaves their line or you simply don't want to have a tenure-track faculty in that classroom, how do you cover the instruction? But you are right; one of the things we are addressing in number nine is demand. While it has to be to some extent driven by instruction alone, it cannot ever just rest there because there are other considerations. The reason for the short/long-term planning is what we find is the number of people who left the job in the previous year and so we were able to authorize this many jobs in the next year. It is not that short-term planning is unimportant, but sometimes the emphasis on that is too much weighted on the year by year. We are looking for a longer-range vision and a publicized longer-ranged vision.

### **03.11.13.08 Code of Ethics-Revised (Rules Committee)**

**Senator Fazel:** We used to have a Code of Ethics that was just for the faculty. In 2006, we updated the code, streamlining it. At that time it was changed to a Code of Ethics for all university employees. The code referred to a number of documents that were related to it leaving the details and specifics to other policies. Last year on the Executive Committee, we had an appeal that made us think that our current code doesn't have enough specifics in terms of ethical conduct. We went back to the old code to help us better understand what is expected of us as university employees. The policy number for the code was 3.3, which refers to faculty. Now that it is for everyone, we are proposing to change it to 1.17. We updated the links to other policies.

Item number eight we broke up into two separate items. There were too many issues under one point. That's why we decided to divide it into two—one that would deal with affirmative action and equal opportunity and the other one that would deal with how we treat our colleagues. For number eight, we have developed a new policy that includes more specific language in terms of what is expected in terms of our behavior and conduct relative to our colleagues. Number eight refers us to policy 1.17A, which is the Professional Relationships Policy. We have added item number 15 participation in political activities because we specifically have policies about employees' involvement in political activities but we had never referred to that in the Code of Ethics. We have added to potential violations, "involving faculty", because AFEGC only applies to faculty. Finally, the contact. We used to have just the Office of Vice President and Provost and we added the Office of Equal Opportunity, Ethics and Access.

**Senator Horst:** Does this apply to student workers?

**Senator Fazel:** This would cover anyone who is employed by Illinois State University.

**Senator Horst:** How does that intersect with the Student Code of Conduct?

**Senator Fazel:** They are not contradictory. There are certain behaviors we expect from them as an employee and there are certain behaviors that we expect from them as a student.

**Senator Horst:** Because you are making references to other documents, perhaps you should reference the Student Code of Conduct.

**Senator Fazel:** They have to abide by this as an employee. Then they also have to abide by the Student Code of Conduct, but the Student Code of Conduct would not be a part of this.

### **03.11.13.09    *Professional Relationships Policy (Rules Committee)***

**Senator Fazel:** In policy 1.17A, we are making statements about what is acceptable and what is not acceptable in terms of behavior and conduct. We are repeating what we said in item eight that members of the academic community should treat colleagues with respect, civility and decency. They should refrain from making rash statements and criticisms. This is rephrasing what was in the old Code of Ethics. All institutional relationships should be professional in nature. The fact that people should not accept hearsay. If you are making a statement concerning other people's work, their moral or professional character or any other attribute, you should be willing to personally support your statements and to supply evidence of their accuracy. Number three, membership in the academic community imposes an obligation to respect others rights to express differing opinions. Number four, university employees should respect their obligations to their departments. If they decide to terminate their employment, they should give sufficient notice.

### **03.12.13.01    *Student Bereavement Policy (Student Government Association)***

**Senator Manno:** This policy comes from the Student Government Association. Students lack protection in the event that a family member or someone close to a student had passed away. It would grant them the ability to focus on the traumatic situation rather than on academic work that may be on the horizon. The benchmarking found that students who suffer the loss of a family member during their academic year can dramatically affect the student's ability to carry out their academics to the best of their ability. A bereavement policy exists at ISU for employees, but there is no policy for students. This policy combines a funeral leave policy and a bereavement policy. Currently, the decision on whether or not a student is excused and to be able to properly go through bereavement or attend the funeral is up to the discretion of the student's many instructors. This policy is meant to streamline the process and have one form of communication from the student to the instructor facilitated by the Dean of Students Office. If a death occurs, the student can contact the Dean of Students Office and the dean will send an email to the student's instructors alerting them of the situation. The student will then

be able to take the time they need under the policy to go to a funeral and use the time for bereavement. Upon their return, they will give proper documentation to the Dean of Students Office proving that they were using this policy for the reason that was stated. Another email will be sent to the instructors that the documentation has been seen and is legitimate. An instructor may obtain the documentation upon request. Under this policy, students will be excused from their classes during the time indicated and will be given proper time to make up any work that they have missed. It is the responsibility of the student for all materials covered in class and work to be completed for the time missed.

**Senator Bushell:** Can you clarify why the communication does not go directly to the instructor?

**Senator Manno:** The intent is to streamline the process. A student can have five instructors. If something were to occur, they would have to go to each instructor and may get five different responses on whether or not they may be excused. The student would communicate with the Dean of Students Office. That information will be put to each instructor. They will all receive the same information and it will ensure that the reason they are missing is for a legitimate reason. It makes it consistent and transparent.

**Senator Cox:** The rationale for going through the Dean of Students Office is to streamline the excuse process. Do you foresee a similar policy being introduced for absences due to illness?

**Senator Manno:** It's up to the student to transmit orally to the instructor. This is a unique circumstance that could happen to a student.

**Senator Cox:** How is it unique from an illness or injury that is also unforeseen but a burden to the student?

**Senator Manno:** The mental effects of a student losing a member of their family—extensive research has been done at other universities to document student bereavement and the effects on their academic work. Trying to balance losing a parent or other family member and trying to make a test and comparing that to simply being sick, I don't see the comparison, although I do see that they could struggle, but that's up to the instructor's discretion.

**Senator Cox:** I worry about that description simply sick. I have students with mental illnesses; I have students with long-term diseases and chronic pain that I think would justify a similar process if this same rationale is extended for bereavement. I am wondering if you might consider other extenuating circumstances in the same light.

**Senator Manno:** I would agree that there should be something in place and that is something that the Student Government Association will look at adding to a policy that might already be in place or adding a new one.

**Senator Cox:** Does this take the discretion away from the instructor once the Dean of Students has investigated and sanctioned a bereavement or a leave?

**Senator Manno:** Under this policy, if it is documented that it is for a loss of a family member and they are attending a funeral, they are covered under this policy as an excused absence.

**Senator Morey:** If we have a policy like this, it takes a little off me as the instructor if students do have to show some verification that indeed this happened and why they are missing class. I hadn't given any thought to how far away is this and how many days might be. How far into the friend and family structure does this go? I guess students would have to talk to someone in the Dean of Students Office to clarify that.

**Senator Manno:** The whole intention is to streamline it and take some burden off the instructor to balance how much time am I giving to a certain student or what is the relationship there or knowing whether or not it's a legitimate instance that is occurring.

**Senator Maykuth:** I thought that this policy might be a problem with certain professors stating that it would be misused. Our job at Student Government is to protect those who have these incidences happen to them. At the professional level, I am sure there may be cases where the policy is misused.

**Senator Bushell:** I suggest an addition to this policy to add at the end about process that the students still make a connection with their professor. It might not be face to face, but communicate immediately to them that they have looked at this policy and that they have dealt with the Dean of Students and I am leaving on a funeral leave.

**Senator Manno:** Within the policy, that would all be laid out in the email that they receive from the Dean of Students and also in the policy, ultimately, the student is responsible for all material covered in class and must work with each individual professor as soon as they return to complete any required work. There is that interaction that must be maintained between the student and the instructor.

**Senator Hoelscher:** I am in favor of the policy because it takes a load off of me in terms of verification, but at the same time, I think it is always the student's responsibility to communicate with the professor directly and then the verification comes down the line.

**Senator Manno:** The intent of this policy is for the student's need of a safety net. Once they communicate with that instructor and they are not budging, they at least have this to fall back on. 99% of the students the first thing they are going to think of is to talk to their instructor and at least inform them of what's going on.

**Senator Wilson:** For most students, they are definitely going to want to consult their professors about this. It might not be initially, so I think it's important that they can go to the Dean of Students about this. Maybe after a day or two and the initial shock is over, you can come and see what I'm going to miss with my academics and talk to professors, but I think it's nice that you can talk to the Dean of Students, leave and then deal with it a day or two after.

**Senator Manno:** Once the student approaches the Dean of Students Office, they are properly trained in this area and would probably communicate with them, one, to try and calm them down and inform them that they would have to talk to their instructors. Has this been communicated? This is the process that will go on if you want to implement this policy. I don't want to undercut the capability of the DOS Office and their exceptional skills in dealing with this on a day-to-day basis.

**Senator Stewart:** Though this policy has not gone into effect, I had this experience that one of my students went to take care of her father who was in late stage Hodgkin's. He passed away while she was there. She notified Dean of Students. I got a notification from Dean of Students. I really like that system. It made it much easier to work with that student. It took the guess work out of it.

**Senator Cox:** I too would like to lend my support to the policy. I think it needs, however, to be in the forefront of Student Government's mind to expand the role of the Dean of Students to other instances that also are posing special challenges to students. I would be very glad to be relieved of that verification process.

**Vice President Dietz:** I feel a bit of a dilemma because the Dean of Students is one of the departments that reports to our division. I want to be supportive of the policy. One concern that I have is that the Dean of Students not be perceived as the hammer or enforcer. My experience is that faculty have been very supportive of students. There are a few folks that haven't. I don't think that the students should be completely relieved of

the responsibility in this. The DOS Office does have a dean on duty. That individual handles one individual at a time. They can't handle multiple folks that come in within the same hour. I am sensitive to the staffing in that office. I don't have a solution; I just wanted to bring up some concerns I have about the policy.

**Senator Kalter:** I want to thank the Dean of Students Office and Student Affairs because it is a workload on you and it is really nice for you to volunteer to do that. If we do expand it, we have to see how this goes first and see how much additional work you have. When we pass it, and it sounds like from the discussion that we probably will, it might be a good idea to publicize it by sending out an email to the faculty.

### ***03.07.19.03 Grading Practice Policy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

**Senator Horst:** This policy clarifies that if you are going to create some sort of experimental grading policy, that needs to be approved by the dean of the college and the Vice President and Provost. We added some language just to clarify that grading is the prerogative of the faculty, however, if it deviates, it needs to be approved. We added references to other statements made in other university policies regarding grading practices.

**Senator Maykuth:** It states based on professionally judged academic performance. Teachers have different syllabi and a lot of departments have different takes on attendance and so do professors. I am wondering if the academic performance is solely based on the letter grade accomplished by the student or the overall performance meaning attending class and everything else.

**Senator Horst:** The professional there is the faculty and they are judging your academic performance. It must not be based on your personality, whether they liked you or irrelevant matters.

**Senator Maykuth:** I am asking about the grade itself because there are different takes on attending class. I would think that good academic performance would be attending class. Some teachers do not have that policy in their syllabi. Is it the overall performance?

**Senator Horst:** That would be in the syllabus how they are going to grade you if attendance was part of the grade.

### ***Adjournment***

**Motion XLIV-59:** By Senator Hoelscher to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.